

<u>Members Present</u>:
P. Betkoski (PB), M. Krenesky (MK), W. Hopkinson (WH), J. Carroll (JC), T. Carey (TC), K. Brennan (KB),
D. Fennell (DF)
<u>Members Absent</u>:
G. Smith (GS), S. West (SW)
<u>Others Present</u>: 9 Members of the public.

1. <u>Call to Order:</u>

JC called the meeting to order at 8:29 PM.

<u>BOF Discussion and Action on Budget:</u>
 WH: The proposed new position for Asst. Public Works Director has proved to be a point of contention and is in question. Requested to go through the position again. Q/A followed. See below.

Q: WH-May we see the job description for this position? Can we go over this description?

*N. Nau-provided the job description on the screen. *

A: MK- A draft has been created and is subject to change. It is currently under review. There are three position's job descriptions that will be realigned pending the approval of this position.

Q: **WH**-Would you go over the portion that states "assisting with policies and departmental regulations"?

A: N. Nau-There is currently no one overseeing this aspect of the department. There are no PPE requirements in place and being enforced.

Q: WH- Would like to go over the portion that states, "Plays a key role in the preparation and implementation of budgets including fiscal controls." Is this something that Rob is currently handling?

A: N. Nau-It is not being done at the caliber that other public works directors are comparatively doing it. There are requirements that are not currently being met. This is not a reflection on Rob as an individual.

Q: WH-How does Naugatuck currently do it?

A: N. Nau-To be clear Naugatuck has a town engineer on staff. Granby is a similar town to compare against current market is around 90. It will be tough to find someone at that, director positions are going for much higher.

WH- Are we expecting more of the foreman than we should?E. Schwarz- Rob wears many hats. There will be more projects in the future. A major infrastructure is coming and there needs to be a liaison between the town and the engineers of the data center.

Q: WH- Are we going to be rewriting the job description of the road foreman?

A: N. Nau-Yes. It does not require major changes. However, there will be some minor changes. I cannot speculate.



Q: Please tell me if I am summarizing this correctly. "The addition of this position will result in a more efficiently run department. And in addition, prepare the town for the larger projects we have coming on the horizon. And, free up the foreman and the asst. foreman hours to be able to do physical work rather than paperwork. Is that an accurate assessment?"

A: N. Nau and MK yes, that accurately depicts the intentions of this position.

Discussion opened between the BOS and BOF.

PB - Mentioned not being in favor of this position. He would like to add two maintainers instead of this position.

TC - Went over the potential cost of adding two maintainer positions rather than the position in question. **DF-** Mentioned that this position is needed for the intention of accountability.

Discussion followed.

MK - May I make a point of order?

JC - Yes.

MK-Inquired on the timing of a closure in discussion and the point of action.

JC- Responded that they will get to the action portion of the agenda as soon as the board has gone through their concerns.

TC- Had a question on the amount that our taxes will be going up. He asked that JC go over the way that he explained it to his neighbors.

JC- Just because the value of your home went up 15 % that does not mean that your taxes will go up 15%. There is a difference between the new mil rate against the newly assessed homes.

JC- There are two adjustments to the budget that will need to be made before it goes to a vote.

N. Nau- At the BOF meeting on the 10th. The land use admin position stipend needed to increase to reflect a 15-hour work week. It was \$10,400.00 and is now at \$15,600.

Motion was made to increase the Land Use Administrator position from 10,400 to 15,600 by **KB**, seconded by **TC**. All ayes

Next adjustment is to the Finance Administrative Assistant salary. At the BOF meeting on the 10th the first selectman proposed an increase in salary for the finance administrative assistant.

Motion was made to increase the Finance Administrative Assistant's salary from 52,390 to 53,690 by **DF**, seconded by **KB**. All ayes.

Discussion followed.

Q: WH will there be a flow of employees asking for raises? A: N. Nau-Not to my knowledge.

In preparation for the action portion of the evening **JC** made his concerns aware regarding the lack of residents in favor of the budget.



Motion to approve the budget as it was just amended, totaling 24,321,549 made by **TC**, seconded by **KB**. All ayes.

Discussion followed. WH made her concerns aware on if it was the right time to bring these changes forward. DF went over where we are at with current inflation rate compared to this raise in taxes at a rough 4%. KB posed the question, are we going to thank ourselves in the next few years for the decisions we make today? Discussion concluded with; we will see how it plays out pending the vote at the town meeting.

BOS portion of the meeting began at 9:03 P.M:

Motion was made to set the Special Town Meeting date to May 24, 2022, at 57 N. Main St. Beacon Falls CT 06403 at 7:00 P.M. by **MK**, not seconded. Motion did not carry.

Second motion was made to set the Special Town Meeting date to May 25, 2022, at 57 N. Main St. Beacon Falls CT 06403 at 7:00 P.M. by **PB**, seconded by **MK**. All ayes.

Motion to adjourn at 9:08 P.M. was made by MK, seconded by PB. All ayes.

Respectfully submitted,

dam A. Jull

Lauren A. Fennell Clerk, Board of Selectmen